

Remarks

Claims 6-10 are pending in the application. Claim 10 is indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 6-9 have been amended. New claims 11-16 have been added to the application. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that in claim 6, line 6, the feature “whose rear end is held so that the rear end can slide” is confusing and unclear. In claim 6, line 9, the language “the rear” should be “a rear.” In claim 7, line 2, the language “the locking part” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 6 has been amended to correct antecedent basis and to clarify that the latching arm has a rear end positioned adjacent to a surface of the shielding shell so that the rear end can slide on the surface of the shielding shelf. Claim 7 has been amended to correct antecedent basis and to clarify that which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 8 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claim 9 has been amended to correct antecedent basis. In view of the amendments presented herein, removal of the rejection of claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirai (US Patent No. 5,545,052).

With regard to claims 6-7, the Examiner stated that Hirai teaches an insulating housing 2 having contacts 3. A shielding shell 4a, 4b, 5 is externally mounted on the insulating housing 2. A conductive latching arm 6 is disposed on the outside of the shielding shell 4a, 4b, 5. The latching arm 6 has an engaging part 6a, a press part 6, and a rear end that is engaged and slid on a surface 7 of the shielding shell 4a, 4b, 5. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Hirai teaches all the elements of claims 6 and 7.

Claim 6 has been amended under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, to state that the latching arm has a rear end positioned adjacent to a surface of the shielding shell so that the rear end can slide on the surface of the shielding shell. Hirai teaches an electrical connector 1 having an insulating member 2 covered with a metallic shell 4. The shell 4 is provided with a pair of resilient pieces 6 each having an engaging piece in the form of a locking claw 6a. Each resilient piece 6 is bent substantially into a J-shape, and has a first end fixed to the shell 4 and a second end that is a free end having resilient movement in a lateral direction. A cover 5 is arranged to enclose or cover part of the shell 4 and is provided with a flexible portion 7 that covers the free end of the resilient piece 6. As discussed in column 4, lines 13-17, to disengage two electrical connectors, the resilient piece 6 is urged toward the shell 4 by the flexible portion 7 to move the locking claw 6a inward thereby releasing the engagement of the locking claw 6a from a mating connector. Unlike the claimed invention which requires a rear end of the latching arm to be positioned adjacent to a surface of the shielding shell so that the rear end can slide on the surface of the shielding shell, the second of the resilient piece 6 of Hirai is arranged parallel to a surface of the shell 4 and is urged toward the shell 4 in a lateral direction. Because the second end of the resilient piece 6 of Hirai is not positioned such that it can slide on the surface of the shell, Hirai

does not teach all the elements of claim 6. Removal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 6. As previously discussed, Hirai does not teach all the elements of amended claim 6. Because Hirai does not teach all the elements of amended claim 6, Hirai does not teach all the elements of claim 7. Further, claim 7 has been amended to state that the latching arm has a shallow inverted v-shape. Hirai teaches in column 3, lines 21-25, that the resilient piece 6 is bent substantially into a J-shape. Hirai, therefore, does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 7. Removal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirai (US Patent No. 5,545,052).

With regard to claims 8-9, the Examiner stated that Hirai teaches all the elements as previously discussed except the engaging part of the latching arm being an engaging hole. The Examiner further stated that to form the engaging part 6a of the latching arm as an engaging hole instead of a projection would have been an obvious modification since such a change would provide the same result and is old and well known in the art. The Examiner, therefore, concluded that Hirai teaches or suggests all the elements of claims 8-9.

Claims 8-9 depend from independent claim 6 and intervening claim 7. As previously discussed, Hirai does not teach all the elements of independent claim 6 or intervening claim 7. Because Hirai does not teach all the elements of claims 6 or 7 except for the engaging part of the latching arm being an engaging hole instead of a projection, Hirai does not teach or suggest all

the elements of claims 8-9. Removal of the rejection of claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

4. New claims 11-16 have been added to the application.

Claims 11-12 depend from independent claim 6. Claims 11-12 are considered to be in condition for allowance, because the prior art fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 6, as previously discussed, and, as such, the prior art also fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claims 11-12. Additionally, the prior art fails to teach or suggest a latching arm including tongue parts protruding from both sides of the front end, or a shielding shell including protruding parts formed to hold the rear end of the latching arm adjacent to the surface of the shielding shell and all of the claim limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 13 is considered to be in condition for allowance because the prior art fails to teach or suggest an electrical connector comprising an insulating housing having contacts, a shielding shell externally mounted on the insulating housing, a conductive latching arm disposed on an outside surface of the shielding shell, the latching arm having a front end fastened to the shielding shell and a rear end arranged on the outside surface of the shielding shell such that the rear end slides on the outside surface, the latching arm having an engaging part which is located near the front end of the latching arm, the engaging part cooperates with a mating engaging part of a mating connector, the latching arm has a pressing part which is located on the rear part of the latching arm, and a covering enclosure is formed on the outside of the shielding shell, the covering enclosure having a finger-catch part that is engageable to push the pressing part to release the mating engaging part from the engaging part. Claims 14-16 depend from independent claim 13. Because claim 13 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the

reasons set forth herein, claims 14-16 are also considered to be in condition for allowance.

Additionally, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the individual elements of claims 14-16 in combination with their base claim and any intervening claims.

Examination of new claims 11-16 is respectively requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroshi Shirai, Applicant



Jennifer Mae Slonaker
Registration No. 50568
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: 717.399.1535
Facsimile: 717.291.4660